



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/749,936	12/30/2003	Brett D. Brewer	306397.01	6684
22971	7590	03/31/2008		
MICROSOFT CORPORATION ONE MICROSOFT WAY REDMOND, WA 98052-6399			EXAMINER RAYYAN, SUSAN F	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2167	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/31/2008	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

roks@microsoft.com  
ntovar@microsoft.com  
a-rydore@microsoft.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/749,936	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BREWER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> SUSAN FOSTER RAYYAN	<b>Art Unit</b> 2167	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 February 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 10-17, 19-21, 23-25 and 27-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 10-17, 19-21, 23-25 and 27-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on February 6, 2008 has been entered.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

2. Claims 8-9, 18, 22, 26 are canceled.
3. Claims 1-7, 10-17, 19-21, 23-25, 27-37 are currently pending.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claim 1-3,6-7,10,12-15,17,19-20, 33, 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Number 6,564,213 issued to Ruben E. Ortega et al ("Ortega") and US 2004/0143564 issued to William Gross et al. ("Gross") and US Patent Publication 2003/0225756 issued to Songqiao Liu ("Liu").**

**As per independent claim 1** Ortega teaches:

a) defining one or more query related character patterns that do not include an explicit indicator of query submission (Figure 2A, Ref.No. 60, user types in SO);

b) monitoring entry of query defining characters by a user to detect entry of a defined query related character pattern (Figure 2A, displays the auto completion strings (refinement options) for “SO”);

providing the user with one or more suggested query refinement options each time a defined query related character pattern is detected without requiring the user to provide the explicit indicator of the query submission” and “replacing the detected defined query related character ( Figure 2A, Reference No. 62, auto completion strings (refinement options), Figure 2A- 2B and column 5, lines 23-36, Figure 2A displays the auto completion strings (refinement options) for “SO” , the terms and phrases (refinement options) are displayed and the user selects one and the refinement option replaces the “SO” (defined query related character pattern) it is added to the search field and at Figure 2B the display shows the incrementally updated auto completion strings (refinement options) for “SONY” and column 5, lines 46-51, user initiates search without moving stylus).

Ortega does not explicitly teach providing the user with an updated query result each time a defined query related character is detected without requiring the user to provide the explicit indicator of the query submission. Gross does teach this limitation (paragraph 10, lines 6-11, as immediately after each character in a search sting is

entered by the user the user receives immediate feedback and paragraph 13, lines 4-14) to provide immediate feedback and so can decide on the desirability of entering additional search characters. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Ortega with providing the user with an updated query result each time a defined query related character is detected without requiring the user to provide the explicit indicator of the query submission to provide immediate feedback and so can decide on the desirability of entering additional search characters (paragraph 181, lines 5-9).

Ortega and Gross does not explicitly teach a synonym suggestion for the detected defined query related character pattern or a broadening suggestion. Liu does teach this limitation (see figure 2 ref. no. 185 (UF: synonym) and ref.no. 183 (broader term) and paragraph 27, keyword search, paragraph 34, broader terms added to search) to automatically provide additional and meaningful search criteria to a search query... It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ortega and Gross with a synonym suggestion for the detected defined query related character pattern or a broadening suggestion to automatically provide additional and meaningful search criteria to a search query as described by Liu (paragraph 0011).

**As per claim 2**, same as claim arguments above and Ortega teaches:

further comprising tracking queries entered by one or more users and adjusting the suggested query refinement options based on a history of queries previously entered by the one or more users (column 2, lines 20-24 and column 3, lines 10-12).

**As per claim 3**, same as claim arguments above and Ortega teaches:

further comprising tracking results selected by one or more users and adjusting the suggested query refinement options based on a history of results previously selected by the one or more users (column 2, lines 30-35, most popular items in the database).

**As per claim 6**, same as claim arguments above and Ortega teaches:

wherein one defined query related character pattern is a string of characters followed by a space (Figure 2B).

**As per claim 7**, same as claim arguments above and Ortega teaches:

wherein one query related character pattern is a string of characters followed by a predefined time delay before additional characters are entered (column 2, lines 20-25).

**As per claim 10**, same as claim arguments above and Ortega teaches:

further comprising providing a user input that allows the user to adjust the query related character patterns (Figure 2A Reference 60).

**Claim 12 is** rejected based on the same rationale as claim 1.

**As per independent claim 13** Ortega teaches:

providing a user with one or more suggested query refinement options as the user enters query defining characters and “replacing the query defining character” ( Figure 2A, Reference No. 62, auto completion strings (refinement options), Figure 2A- 2B and column 5, lines 23-36, Figure 2A displays the auto completion strings (refinement options) for “SO” , the terms and phrases (refinement options) are displayed and the user selects one and the refinement option replaces the “SO” ( query defining character) it is added to the search field and at Figure 2B the display shows the incrementally updated auto completion strings (refinement options) for “SONY” and column 5, lines 46-51, user initiates search without moving stylus).

b) detecting entry of a query defining word by the user without requiring a user to provide an explicit indicator of query submission (Figure 2B, displays results of the detecting (refinement options) for “SONY” and column 5, lines 46-51, user initiates search without moving stylus).

Ortega does not explicitly teach providing the user with an updated query results each time entry of a query defining word is detected without requiring the user to provide the explicit indicator of the query submission and wherein the query defining

word includes a string of characters followed by a predefined time delay before additional characters are entered by the user. Gross does teach this limitation (paragraph 10, lines 6-11, as immediately after each character in a search sting is entered by the user the user receives immediate feedback and paragraph 13, lines 4-14) to provide immediate feedback and so can decide on the desirability of entering additional search characters. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Ortega with providing the user with an updated query result each time entry of a query defining word is detected without requiring the user to provide the explicit indicator of the query submission and wherein the query defining word includes a string of characters followed by a predefined time delay before additional characters are entered by the user to provide immediate feedback and so can decide on the desirability of entering additional search characters as described by Gross (paragraph 181, lines 5-9).

Ortega and Gross do not explicitly teach a synonym suggestion for the detected defined query related character pattern or a broadening suggestion. Liu does teach this limitation (see figure 2 ref.no. 185 (UF: synonym) and ref.no. 183 (broader term) and paragraph 27, keyword search, paragraph 34, broader terms added to search) to automatically provide additional and meaningful search criteria to a search query. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ortega and Gross with a synonym suggestion for the detected defined query related character pattern or a broadening suggestion to automatically



provide additional and meaningful search criteria to a search query as described by Liu (paragraph 0011).

**As per claim 14**, same as claim arguments above and Ortega teaches:

further comprising tracking queries entered by one or more users and adjusting the suggested query refinement options based on a history of queries previously entered by the one or more users(column 2, lines 20-24 and column 3, lines 10-12)..

**As per claim 15**, same as claim arguments above and Ortega teaches:

comprising tracking results selected by one or more users and adjusting the suggested query refinement options based on a history of results previously selected by the one or more users (column 2, lines 30-35, most popular items in the database).

**As per claim 17**, same as claim arguments above and Ortega teaches:

wherein one defined query related character pattern is a string of characters followed by a space (Figure 2B).

**As per claim 19**, same as claim arguments above and Ortega teaches:

wherein the updated query result list includes result listings from a user hard drive, an intranet server, and an Internet server (column 3, line 25-35).

**Claim 20** is rejected based on the same rationale as claim 13.

**As per claim 33** same as claim arguments above and Liu teaches:

wherein the synonym suggestion further includes a synonym icon and wherein the broadening suggestion further includes a broadening icon (see Figure 2, BT (broadening icon) and UF (synonym icon)).

**As per claim 34** same as claim arguments above and Liu teaches:

wherein the synonym suggestion further includes a synonym icon and wherein the broadening suggestion further includes a broadening icon (see Figure 2, BT (broadening icon) and UF (synonym icon)).

**Claims 5, 21, 23-25, 27-28,35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Number 6,564,213 issued to Ruben E. Ortega et al (“Ortega”) in view of US 2004/0143564 issued to William Gross et al (“Gross”) and US Patent Publication 2003/0225756 issued to Songqiao Liu (“Liu”) in view of US Publication Number 2006/0112178 issued to Taylor N. Van Vleet (“Van Vleet”).**

**As per claim 5**, same as claim arguments above and Ortega and Gross and Liu do not explicitly teach further comprising providing a visual indicator to the user when an updated query result list is provided to the user. Van Vleet does teach this limitation (paragraph 12, 30 and Figure 3, as highlighting the updated search results, Figure 3:

“new search results since”) to personalize search result items. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ortega and Gross and Liu with providing a visual indicator to the user each time the updated query result list is provided to the user to personalize search result items as described by Van Vleet (paragraph 12).

**As per independent claim 21** Ortega teaches:

a) providing a user with auto-complete alternatives as the user enters query defining characters( Figure 2A, Reference No. 62 , auto completion strings (refinement options), Figure 2A- 2B and column 5, lines 23-36, Figure 2A displays the auto completion strings (refinement options) for “SO” and at Figure 2B the display shows the incrementally updated auto completion strings (refinement options) for “SONY”);

b) detecting entry of a completed query defining word by the user (Figure 2B, displays results of the detecting (refinement options) for “SONY”);

d) providing the user with query refinement options related to the query defining word without requiring the user to provide the explicit indicator of the query submission and “replacing the query defining word in the query” (Figure 2B, displays auto completion strings (refinement options) for “SONY” and column 5, lines 46-51, user initiates search without moving stylus) ( Figure 2A, Reference No. 62, auto completion strings (refinement options), Figure 2A- 2B and column 5, lines 23-36, Figure 2A displays the auto completion strings (refinement options) for “SO” , the terms and phrases (refinement options) are displayed and the user selects one and the

refinement option replaces the “SO” (defined query related character pattern) it is added to the search field and at Figure 2B the display shows the incrementally updated auto completion strings (refinement options) for “SONY” and column 5, lines 46-51, user initiates search without moving stylus)

e) determining whether the user selects a provided query refinement option (column 5, lines 37-40, selecting and submitting the auto completion strings (selected refinement option) for searching).

Ortega does not explicitly teach providing the user with a query result list each time a query defining word is detected without requiring the user to provide the explicit indicator of query submission and providing the user with an updated query result list when it is determined that the user has selected a provided query refinement option. Gross does teach this limitation (paragraph 10, lines 6-11, as immediately after each character in a search sting is entered by the user the user receives immediate feedback and paragraph 13, lines 4-14) to provide immediate feedback and so can decide on the desirability of entering additional search characters. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Ortega with providing the user with a query result list each time a query defining word is detected without requiring the user to provide the explicit indicator of query submission and providing the user with an updated query result list when it is determined that the user has selected a provided query refinement option to provide immediate feedback

and so can decide on the desirability of entering additional search characters as described by Gross(paragraph 181, lines 5-9).

Ortega and Gross do not explicitly teach a synonym suggestion for the detected defined query related character pattern or a broadening suggestion. Liu does teach this limitation (see figure 2 ref.no. 185 (UF: synonym) and ref.no. 183 (broader term) and paragraph 27, keyword search, paragraph 34, broader terms added to search) to automatically provide additional and meaningful search criteria to a search query. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ortega and Gross with a synonym suggestion for the detected defined query related character pattern or a broadening suggestion to automatically provide additional and meaningful search criteria to a search query as described by Liu (paragraph 0011).

Ortega and Gross and Liu do not explicitly teach providing a visual indicator to the user each time the updated query result list is provided to the user. Van Vleet does teach this limitation (paragraph 12, 30 and Figure 3, as highlighting the updated search results, Figure 3: "new search results since") to personalize search result items. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ortega and Gross and Liu with providing a visual indicator to the user each time the updated query result list is provided to the user to personalize search result items as described by Van Vleet (paragraph 12).

**As per claim 23**, same as claim arguments above and Ortega teaches:

wherein the updated query result list includes result listings from a user hard drive, an intranet server, and an Internet server (column 3, line 25-35).

**Claim 24** is rejected based on the same rationale as claim 21.

**As per independent claim 25** Ortega teaches:

- a) a query entry text box for entering query defining characters (Figure 2A, search box, Ref.No. 60);
- b) a query refinement option list of user selectable query refinement options( Figure 2A, Reference No. 62 , auto completion strings (refinement options)) that is incrementally updated as a query is entered into the query entry text box ... (Figure 2A- 2B and column 5, lines 23-36, Figure 2A displays the auto completion strings (refinement options) for “SO” and at Figure 2B the display shows the incrementally updated auto completion strings (refinement options) for “SONY”, user can initiate search without moving stylus away from the selected string) and “replacing the query defining characters in the query (column 5, lines 23-36, Figure 2A displays the auto completion strings (refinement options) for “SO” , the terms and phrases (refinement options) are displayed and the user selects one and the refinement option replaces the “SO” -it is added to the search field and at Figure 2B the display shows the incrementally updated auto completion strings (refinement options) for “SONY” .

Ortega does not explicitly teach a query result list that is incrementally updated as a query is entered into the query box without requiring the user to provide the explicit indicator of the query submission. Gross does teach this limitation (paragraph 10, lines 6-11, as immediately after each character in a search string is entered by the user the user receives immediate feedback and paragraph 13, lines 4-14) to provide immediate feedback and so can decide on the desirability of entering additional search characters. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ortega with a query result list that is incrementally updated as a query is entered into the query box without requiring the user to provide the explicit indicator of the query submission to provide immediate feedback and so can decide on the desirability of entering additional search characters (paragraph 181, lines 5-9).

Ortega and Gross do not explicitly teach a synonym suggestion for the detected defined query related character pattern or a broadening suggestion. Liu does teach this limitation (see figure 2 ref.no. 185 (UF: synonym) and ref.no. 183 (broader term) and paragraph 27, keyword search, paragraph 34, broader terms added to search) to automatically provide additional and meaningful search criteria to a search query... It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ortega and Gross with a synonym suggestion for the detected defined query related character pattern or a broadening suggestion to automatically provide additional and meaningful search criteria to a search query as described by Liu (paragraph 0011).

Ortega and Gross and Liu do not explicitly teach a visual indicator that indicates when the query result list is updated. Van Vleet does teach this limitation (paragraph 12, 30 as highlighting the updated search results, Figure 3: “new search results since”) to personalize search result items. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Ortega and Gross and Liu with a visual indicator that indicates when the query result list is updated to personalize search result items as described by Van Vleet (paragraph 12).

**As per claim 27**, same as claim arguments above and Ortega teaches:  
further comprising a user selectable search icon for manually executing a query defined by characters in the query entry text box (Figure 2A, Ref. No. 66).

**As per claim 28**, same as claim arguments above and Ortega teaches:  
wherein the query refinement option list is semi-transparent (Figure 2A, Ref. No. 62).

**As per claim 35** same as claim arguments above and Liu teaches:  
wherein the synonym suggestion further includes a synonym icon and wherein the broadening suggestion further includes a broadening icon (see Figure 2, BT



(broadening icon) and UF (synonym icon)).

**.As per claim 36** same as claim arguments above and Liu teaches:

wherein the synonym suggestion further includes a synonym icon and wherein the broadening suggestion further includes a broadening icon (see Figure 2, BT (broadening icon) and UF (synonym icon)).

.

**Claim 4 , 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ortega and Gross and Liu as applied to claims 1 above and further in view of US Patent Number 6,006225 issued to Dwayne E. Bowman et al (“Bowman”).**

**As per claim 4, 16** same as claim arguments above and Ortega and Gross and Liu do not explicitly teach further comprising tracking results selected by one or more users and adjusting an order of the updated query result list based on a history of results previously selected by the one or more users . Bowman does teach this limitation at column 7, lines 45-50 to produce a successful query result. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Ortega and Gross and Liu with tracking results selected by one or more users and adjusting an order of the updated query result list based on a history of results previously selected by the one or more users to produce a successful query result as described by Bowman (column 2, lines 44-46).

**As per claim 16**, same as claim arguments above and Ortega and Gross and Liu do not explicitly teach tracking results selected by one or more users and adjusting an order of the updated query result list based on a history of results previously selected by the one or more users. Bowman does teach this limitation at column 7, lines 45-50 to produce a successful query result. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Ortega and Gross and Liu with tracking results selected by one or more users and adjusting an order of the updated query result list based on a history of results previously selected by one or more users and adjusting an order to produce a successful query result as described by Bowman (column 2, lines 44-46).

**Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ortega and Gross and Liu in view Van Vleet as applied to claims 25 above, and further in view of US Patent Application Publication Number 2006/0129915 issued to Ning-Ping Chan (“Chan”).**

**As per claim 29**, same as claim arguments above and Ortega and Gross and Liu in view of Van Vleet do not explicitly teach wherein the query result list is animated for a predetermined period of time after the query result list is updated. Chan does teach this limitation at (paragraph 54, blinking search results) to provide a visual cue. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Ortega and Gross and Liu in view of Van Vleet with teach wherein the

query result list is animated for a predetermined period of time after the query result list is updated to provide a visual cue as described by Chan (paragraph 114).

**Claim 11, 30-32, 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Number 6,564,213 issued to Ruben E. Ortega et al (“Ortega”) and US 2004/0143564 issued to William Gross et al. (“Gross”) in view of US Patent Publication 2003/0225756 issued to Songqiao Liu (“Liu”) and further in view of in view of US Patent Application Publication Number 2003/0182463 issued to Jeffery W. Valk (“Valk”).**

**As per claim 11**, same as claim arguments above and Ortega and Gross in view of Liu do not explicitly teach in response to a change in a connection speed at a client-server connection ... to occur more frequently as the connection speed increases. Valk does teach this limitation (paragraph 59, as connection speed limits ability to provide information such as dialup versus high speed and it is desirable to limit the amount of information sent to what is needed to perform complex tasks, can run quickly even in the most remote locations on low-bandwidth for smaller companies, yet remain robust enough to handle the complicated needs facing multi-billion dollar companies. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the datasets (defined query related character patterns) of Ortega and Gross in view Liu with in response to a change in a connection speed at a client-server connection ... to occur more frequently as the connection speed increases to perform

complex tasks, can run quickly even in the most remote locations on low-bandwidth for smaller companies, yet remain robust enough to handle the complicated needs facing multi-billion dollar companies as described by Valk (paragraph 14, lines 19-26).

**As per independent claim 30** Ortega teaches:

- a) a user input device enabling input of query defining text characters (Figure 2A, search box, Ref.No. 60);
- b) a display (Figure 1);
- c) a data content that is searchable (column 2, lines 10-15, searchable database);  
a network connection for accessing at least a portion of the data content (column 2, lines 10-15);
- d) a memory in which machine instructions are stored (Figure 1);
- e) a processor that is coupled to the user input device, to the display, to the data content, to the network connection and to the memory, the processor executing the machine instructions to carry out a plurality of functions (Figure 1), including:
  - i) defining one or more query related character patterns that do not include an explicit indicator of query submission (column 2, lines 6-8, generating auto completion strings datasets);
  - ii) monitoring entry of query defining characters by a user to detect entry of a defined query related character pattern (column 5, lines 27-29, query entered and suggested auto completion strings (character pattern) are displayed);

providing the user with query refinement options each related to the detected defined query character pattern without requiring the user to provide the explicit indicator of the query submission ( Figure 2A, Reference No. 62 , auto completion strings (refinement options), Figure 2A- 2B and column 5, lines 23-36, Figure 2A displays the auto completion strings (refinement options) for “SO” and at Figure 2B the display shows the incrementally updated auto completion strings (refinement options) for “SONY” and column 5, lines 46-51, user initiates search without moving stylus); replacing the detected defined query related character pattern (column 5, lines 23-36, Figure 2A displays the auto completion strings (refinement options) for “SO”, the terms and phrases (refinement options) are displayed and the user selects one and the refinement option replaces the “SO” -it is added to the search field and at Figure 2B the display shows the incrementally updated auto completion strings (refinement options) for “SONY”.

changing the defined query related character patterns (column 2, lines 35-37, as datasets (defined query related character patterns) are customized for users or user groups and column 3, lines 42-50 teaches a variety of devices such as PDA and conventional PCs and column 4, lines 34-44, as downloading new datasets (defined query related character patterns).

Ortega does not explicitly teach searching the data content and providing the user with an updated query result when a ... query ... is detected without requiring the user to provide the explicit indicator of query submission. Gross does teach this limitation

(paragraph 10, lines 6-11, as immediately after each character in a search sting is entered by the user the user receives immediate feedback and paragraph 13, lines 4-14) to provide immediate feedback and so can decide on the desirability of entering additional search characters. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ortega with searching the data content and providing the user with an updated query result when a ... query ... is detected without requiring the user to provide the explicit indicator of query submission to provide the explicit indicator of the query submission to provide immediate feedback and so can decide on the desirability of entering additional search characters (paragraph 181, lines 5-9).

Ortega and Gross do not explicitly teach a synonym suggestion for the detected defined query related character pattern or a broadening suggestion. Liu does teach this limitation (see figure 2 ref.no. 185 (UF: synonym) and ref.no. 183 (broader term) and paragraph 27, keyword search, paragraph 34, broader terms added to search) to automatically provide additional and meaningful search criteria to a search query. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ortega and Gross with a synonym suggestion for the detected defined query related character pattern or a broadening suggestion to automatically provide additional and meaningful search criteria to a search query as described by Liu (paragraph 0011).

Ortega and Gross and Liu do not explicitly teach in response to a change in a connection speed at a client-server connection. Valk does teach this limitation (paragraph 59, as connection speed limits ability to provide information such as dialup versus high speed and it is desirable to limit the amount of information sent to what is needed to perform complex tasks, can run quickly even in the most remote locations on low-bandwidth for smaller companies, yet remain robust enough to handle the complicated needs facing multi-billion dollar companies. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the datasets (defined query related character patterns) of Ortega and Gross and Liu with in response to a change in a connection speed at a client-server connection to perform complex tasks, can run quickly even in the most remote locations on low-bandwidth for smaller companies, yet remain robust enough to handle the complicated needs facing multi-billion dollar companies as described by Valk (paragraph 14, lines 19-26).

**As per claim 31**, same as claim arguments above and Ortega teaches:

wherein the searchable database resides on one or more remote computers and data used to define the one or more query related character patterns resides on a user terminal (column 3, lines 5-15, column 4, lines 36-40).

**As per claim 32**, same as claim arguments above and Ortega teaches:

wherein the data content includes data stored on a user hard drive, data stored on an intranet server, and data stored on an Internet server (column 3, line 25-35).

**As per claim 37 same** as claim arguments above and Liu teaches:

wherein the synonym suggestion further includes a synonym icon and wherein the broadening suggestion further includes a broadening icon (see Figure 2, BT (broadening icon) and UF (synonym icon)).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed February 6, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues prior art of record does not teach wherein the one or more suggested query refinement options includes at least one of a synonym suggestion for replacing the detected defined query related character pattern in a query or a broadening suggestion for replacing the detected defined query related character pattern in the query to broaden the query."

Applicant submits that Liu fails to disclose or suggest "a synonym suggestion for replacing the detected defined query related character pattern in a query or a broadening. A search pane 180 is used for the actual search process (Figure 3; [0030]). With search pane 180, a user can add (Boolean "OR") alternative terms, such as a Synonym 185, to the search ([0033]). The user's original search term is ORed with the Synonym, the user's original search term is not replaced with the Synonym. In contrast, the Applicant replaces the original search term with a synonym suggestion. Thus, Liu fails to disclose or suggest "a synonym suggestion for replacing the detected defined



query related character pattern in a query' . Also, with search pane 180, a user can add (Boolean "AND") additional features, such as a Broader Term 183, to "improve the precision of the search" ([0032]). Liu provides an example that a search can be refined by ANDing a query term with a Broader Term 183 to reduce the number of search results (i.e., narrow the search) ([0035]). The user's original search term is ANDed with the Broader Term, the user's original search term is not replaced with the Broader Term. In contrast, the Applicant replaces the original search term with a broadening suggestion to provide a broader auerv. Thus, Liu fails to disclose or suggest "a broadening suggestion for replacing the detected defined query related character pattern in the query to broaden the query' ." "Liu's search pane 180 in Figure 3 provides only the options of adding terms using AND and OR but provides no option to replace the user's search term with another term."

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Ortega teaches **"providing the user with one or more suggested query refinement options each time a defined query related character pattern is detected without requiring the user to provide the explicit indicator of the query submission"** and **"replacing the detected defined query related character"**. ( Figure 2A, Reference No. 62, auto completion strings (refinement options), Figure 2A- 2B and column 5, lines 23-36, Figure 2A displays the auto completion strings (refinement options) for "SO" , the terms and phrases (refinement options) are displayed and the user selects one and the refinement option replaces the "SO" (defined query related character pattern) it is added to the search field and at Figure 2B the display shows the incrementally updated auto completion strings

(refinement options) for "SONY" and column 5, lines 46-51, user initiates search without moving stylus). Ortega does not explicitly teach **wherein the one or more suggested query refinement options includes at least one of a synonym suggestion for ... the detected defined query related character pattern in a query or a broadening suggestion for .... the detected defined query related character pattern in the query to broaden the query.**". Ortega and Gross does not explicitly teach a synonym suggestion for ... the detected defined query related character pattern in a query or a broadening suggestion... Liu does teach this limitation (see figure 2 ref. no. 185 (UF: synonym) and ref.no. 183 (broader term) and paragraph 27, keyword search, paragraph 34, broader terms added to search ) to automatically provide additional and meaningful search criteria to a search query .. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ortega and Gross with a synonym suggestion for the detected defined query related character pattern or a broadening suggestion to automatically provide additional and meaningful search criteria to a search query as described by Liu (paragraph 0011).

***Contact Information***

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan F. Rayyan whose telephone number is 571-272-1675. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on 571-272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John R. Cottingham/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art  
Unit 2167

Susan Rayyan  
March 19, 2008